





**SWAY'S REMEDIES.**  
INDORSING  
**WAY'S R. R. REMEDIES**  
Using Them for Several Years.  
Jan. 4, 1877.—DEAR SIR: Having for several years used your remedies, but always failing to find them really active, I have written to you again, in the desire effect, to ascertain whether they are still in use. I have written to you by my name, as I have promised "relinquishing your inv."

THURLOW WEED.

**R. R.**  
**Y'S READY RELIEF**  
Worst Pains in from One to Twenty Minutes.

**ONE HOUR**  
This advertisement need any one's PAUL. It was the case, and it is the only Pain Remedy.

stop the most excruciating pains, also curc's, congestion, whatever of the body, glands, or organs by

ON TO TWENTY MINUTES,  
violent or excruciating the pain, the greatest, the most severe, the most agonizing.

**Y'S READY RELIEF**

AFFORD INSTANT RELIEF

of the Kidneys, Bladder, Urethra, Bowels, & Sore Throat, Difficult Breathing, Falicitation of the Heart, Croup, Diphtheria, Inflammation, Toothache, Neuralgia, Rheumatism, Cold Chills, Argo Cramps, Chilblains, and Frost Bites.

OF THE READY RELIEF to the part of the body which suffers will afford instant relief.

A small bottle of water will cure Stomach, Chills, Convulsions, & Diseases of the Liver, Gall-bladder, Dyspepsia, Colic, &c.

and always carry a bottle of RADWAY'S ready relief in your pocket.

akes or pain from change of water, & from change of climate.

Radway's Ready Relief is a stimulant.

VER AND AGUE.

ACUTE cases. There is not a more effective remedy than Radway's.

and other Malaria, Bilious, Scrofulous, & Tremulous Diseases.

ADAY'S READY RELIEF. Five cent

per bottle.

LT! BEAUTY!

are Rich Beauty—Increase of Flesh and Skin and Beautiful Complexion secured

R. RADWAY'S

parian Resolvent

the most astonishing cures so quick, spreads the body undermost the indus-

wonderful medicines.

ay an increase in Flesh and weight is seen and felt.

**GREAT BLOOD PURIFIER.**

of the Sarpanthine Resolvent cures,

the Blood, Sust. Urine, and other parts of the system, the vigor of life, for the support of the body, and the removal of all disease.

Chronic, Glandular Disease, & other parts of the system.

Sore Eyes, Strain,

Gravel, & other diseases.

Fractures, Fever, Sores, &c.

in the Fish, & Cancer.

in all parts of the body.

of this wonder medicine, & it is now found to prove to any person using it for a few days, that it is a great

aid, daily becoming reduced by the wondrous

qualities that are continually progressing.

and other maladies made from healthy blood—and this

once this remedy commences its work, it is tried everywhere.

it nothing but good.

it would try it, but had no faith in it.

and when a box of Radway's Pills, and a box of Radway's Resolvent, and when there is a

small of the back and along the side.

the close of his

the high-spirited question,

Mr. DUFFEY.

made for the South Side Company.

His chief point was that the Company had obtained a charter from the city to operate their very cars, which it proposed to impose the \$50 license. The Company, in fact, had license already. No, it was not a complete license, but it had a right to an injunction, and that it had granted by virtue of its contract, as did the New Avenue Company, and the amount of a license was not paid.

had been found in the books inconsistent with the law laid down in the New York case.

The case, referred to the City of Philadelphia, was the Pease vs. the City of Philadelphia, No. 687, trial, etc., by the in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second. The Court of Appeals, in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

In a New York case, the

City of New York, the Court of Appeals held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and unwise, but oppressive.

in the First, and the Court of Appeals in the Second, held that an attempt to regulate certain charter rights or subsequent legislation, or the creation of a tax, as in this case, was not only unconstitutional, but impolitic, and un







## THE COURTS.

**Harper's Bondsmen Relieved from Liability for the Fees**

**Which the Ex-Grain-Inspector Refused to Turn Over to the State.**

**The Appellate Court Declares the City Scrip to Be Legal**

**New Suits, Bankruptcies, Divorces, Confessions, Etc.**

Judge Bowles yesterday decided the demurmer to the declaration in the case of People vs. William H. Harper and his sureties. The case was brought to recover \$200,000 which Harper, as Chicago Mayor, paid to Chicago, and collected over and above the expenses of running the city. When he retired he kept the balance, and was sued on his official bond.

The Judge, after stating the facts, referred to the Tompkins case, in which the Supreme Court decided that the Board of Commissioners had made no rules for the guidance of the Chief Inspector. It also held that the fees were in the construction of the particular bonds which were made, the surcharges could not be held liable. Their obligation must strictly construed, and could not be extended.

The question then was whether, considering the bond, it was reasonable that it should be paid over funds left in the Chief-Inspector's hands at the expiration of his term of office.

The main duty of the Inspector was to inspect grain. "It does not seem hard on the old Norwegian who had been damaged"—for only the person suffering could maintain the action to recover the fees. It was decided that the suit should be dismissed, and the City Scrip should be rejected.

John Harper had inspected grain sent him from whom he had collected fees for such inspection.

If a sum of \$200,000 was allowed to accumulate, it was through the instrumentality of the Board of Commissioners. Gross injustice had been done to some one, but the parties injured and who was not responsible for one Inspector to collect fees for grain inspected by another. Only sufficient fees should be collected to pay expenses.

The Judge said he was compelled to come to the conclusion that the sureties were not called on to pay the official bond while it was still possible of being held responsible for fees accumulated in the hands of the principal before the time for running expenses.

No such liability existed on a fair construction of the bond. The demurer would therefore be sustained, or the cause dismissed either by statute or by sentence when they signed the bond.

The constitutional question as to the validity of the City Scrip—whether it would be upheld by the Supreme Court—a separate question.

The Ruse was built at Cottrellville by L. Earned in 1852, and was rebuilt in 1873. She rates \$2,000.

The scow Tyro had her forecastle blown away on Lake Michigan last Friday.

A appeal will probably be taken to the Supreme Court.

**THE CITY-SCRIP CASE.**

The Appellate Court yesterday affirmed the decision of the Circuit Court in the case of People vs. Harper, upholding the validity of the new scrip. No opinion was written or delivered. Justice Murphy said that the main point was the same in both the trial and the appeal, and added that he did not deem it necessary to write an opinion. The decision in the case will go to the Supreme Court, and the decision of the Court below would be affirmed.

An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, and the writ-warrant and the city-scrip cases will be argued at the Southern Grand Division of the Court sitting at Mt. Vernon next month. A decision will probably be reached by October.

**THE ARMSTRONG-NEL CASE.**

The case of Armstrong vs. the McNeils came before Justice Farwell yesterday. Mr. Garnett, on behalf of Mr. Armstrong, stated the case, and asked for an injunction. Judge Farwell said he was not satisfied that Mr. Armstrong was willing to waive or have the matter postponed, if the defendant would do nothing to prejudice his client's interests.

Mr. E. A. Otis, on behalf of the defendants, agreed that nothing should be done until after the argument on the motion for injunction was heard, and the matter postponed. No time was set for the hearing, but it was understood the parties should agree on a day.

**Mr. Otis Agrees to Assignee of Hamilton.** Mr. Otis, yesterday filed a petition setting out that Hale & Emerson, the assignees of the McNeils, had sold a large quantity of jewelry, etc., in satisfaction of their rent, and refused to turn it over. The claim for rent was \$1,000. He asked that the court award a decree for the claim, and return the goods. They also offered to rent the store at the rate of \$1,000 a year, while the Assignee occupies. Justice Farwell on the subject, Capt. Clegg, concluded his letter as follows: "Not a particle to be made, and also authorized the Assignee to sell in the ordinary course of trade until June 3. In the meantime he is to advertise for bids for stores and fixtures."

**IN CENTRAL RAILROAD.**

Mr. Otis, on behalf of the McNeils, came before Justice Farwell yesterday. Mr. Garnett, on behalf of Mr. Armstrong, stated the case, and asked for an injunction. Judge Farwell said he was not satisfied that Mr. Armstrong was willing to waive or have the matter postponed, if the defendant would do nothing to prejudice his client's interests.

Mr. Otis, on behalf of the defendants, agreed that nothing should be done until after the argument on the motion for injunction was heard, and the matter postponed. No time was set for the hearing, but it was understood the parties should agree on a day.

**Mr. Otis Agrees to Assignee of Hamilton.** Mr. Otis, yesterday filed a petition setting out that Hale & Emerson, the assignees of the McNeils, had sold a large quantity of jewelry, etc., in satisfaction of their rent, and refused to turn it over. The claim for rent was \$1,000. He asked that the court award a decree for the claim, and return the goods. They also offered to rent the store at the rate of \$1,000 a year, while the Assignee occupies. Justice Farwell on the subject, Capt. Clegg, concluded his letter as follows: "Not a particle to be made, and also authorized the Assignee to sell in the ordinary course of trade until June 3. In the meantime he is to advertise for bids for stores and fixtures."

**POIT HURON.**

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

**WEATHER.** Fine.

Pont Huron, Mich., May 27.—Passed Up-Poops Portage, Wm. Bentou, Toledo, Colorado, H. B. Tufts and co., Mineral Rock and barges; ears Chas. A. Law, Goshen, Eliza Gerich, Oriental Wind-Sail.

